

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated May 4, 2005, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on August 4, 2005. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 9, 11, 13-16 and 19-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Maron et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,439,005) in view of *Fernald et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,668,656). In response, Applicant amended claims 1 and 19 to clarify the invention and canceled claim 22 without prejudice. Additionally, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 recites the limitations of "a connector assembly coupled to the housing, wherein the connector assembly includes a connector feature for mating with a corresponding connector feature of an optical cable; and an optical waveguide coupling the sensing element to the connector assembly, wherein the optical waveguide has a terminus at the connector assembly." Applicant submits that the references do not teach, show or suggest these limitations. Therefore, the references, alone or in combination, cannot render claim 1 obvious. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 1 and claims 9, 11 and 13-16 dependent thereon.

Claim 19 recites the limitations of "a connector assembly configured to optically couple the sensing element to an optical cable disposed external of the housing without the optical cable passing through the housing." Applicant submits that the references, alone or in combination, fail to teach, show or suggest this limitation. Therefore, this failure precludes the references from rendering claim 19 obvious. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 19 and claims 20 and 21 dependent thereon.

PATENT
Atty. Dkt. No. WEAT/0542**Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 23-24 are allowed. Applicant acknowledges allowance of these claims.

Claims 2-8, 10, 12, 13 and 17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response, Applicant submits that these claims are allowable based at least on the traversal presented above regarding the independent claims from which they depend. Additionally, new claims 25 and 26 respectively correspond to previous claims 2 and 10 written in independent form. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

Conclusion

The secondary references made of record are noted. However, it is believed that the secondary references are no more pertinent to the Applicant's disclosure than the primary references cited in the office action. Therefore, Applicant believes that a detailed discussion of the secondary references is not necessary for a full and complete response to this office action.

The references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the invention as claimed. Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Randol W. Read
Registration No. 43,876
MOSER, PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant